



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/533,560

05/20/2005

Gebhard Zobl

SB-514

4363

24131 7590 03/07/2007
LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP
P O BOX 2480
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER

KEMMERLE III, RUSSELL J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1731

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/07/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/533,560	Applicant(s) ZOBL ET AL.	
	Examiner Russell J. Kemmerle	Art Unit 1731	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 May 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02 May 2005; 15 September 2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida (US Patent 6,660,420) in view of Koga (US Patent 6,517,338).

Yoshida discloses a method for forming a separator (i.e., an interconnector) for a fuel cell comprising a two step pressing operation. The process includes pressing the powder to a shape similar to a final desired shape to create a preliminary molded member, then further pressing the preliminary molded member to create a molding of the final desired shape (Col 4 lines 12-16). The separator is generally plate-like with a

plurality of knob like protrusions (See Fig. 1). While the angle of inclination is not specifically given, it appears from the drawings to be approximately 90° (see Figs. 3, 4B and 6). Yoshida further discloses that the dimensions of the preliminary molded member in the direction of the molding pressure (i.e., the height of the knobs) are about 1 to 2 times the dimensions of the final molded member.

Yoshida does not disclose that in the second pressing steps the angle of inclination is increased to between 95° and 170° .

Koga teaches a method of pressing a powder into a desired shape using a set of molding dies to create a fuel cell separator having a number of protrusions extending from the base plate of the separator. Koga discloses that the dies include holes used to form the protrusions which could have an inside wall that is not perpendicular to the other surface, but is instead inclined at a given angle so that the diameter of a protrusion would decrease as it moved away from the base plate (Col 5 lines 7-21). The angle of inclination formed between the base plate and the protrusion is stated as preferably being between 91° and 100° (Col 5 lines 14-15), and appears to be approximately 105° in Fig. 6, however Koga further notes that inclined walls of the die need only to have a inclined (i.e., not perpendicular) inside wall, and that any inclination or shape (i.e., the walls do not need to be linear) would work (Col 5 lines 18-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention by applicant, to have modified the method of forming a fuel cell separator by a two step pressing process as taught by Yoshida with the second pressing step reducing oversized knobs down to a final desired size, with the fuel cell separator pressing

process taught by Koga where the angle of inclination between the base plate and the knob-like protrusion is greater than 90° , since Koga discloses that having such an angle makes it easier to release the pressed piece from the die (Col 5 lines 20-21).

Referring to claim 11, Yoshida and Koga do not specifically disclose that the angle of inclination between the base plate and the knob-protrusions after the first pressing be between 110° and 130° , and be increased by the second pressing to between 115° and 160° . However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant that the angle of inclination taught by Koga, as discussed above, would include angles in both of those ranges. It would have been further obvious that the angle be increased in the second pressing step since that would be the most obvious method of ensuring that the protrusion was uniformly subjected to the pressing force of the second step to result in a further pressed piece as taught by Yoshida, while still allowing for the increased ease of removal as taught by Koga

Referring to claim 12, Yoshida and Koga do not specifically disclose a pre-sintering step after the first pressing stage. It is well known in the art that when a powder is pressed which include known additives to assist in forming the mold (such as a binder or lubricant), that these materials should be burned off prior to sintering by heating the molding to a at temperature which those additives volatilize and are thus removed from the molded piece. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant that when a powder which uses additives is used to form the molding, that a pre-sintering step be used to remove those additives after the piece is molded and before the piece is finally sintered.

Claims 13 -15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Koga and Quadakkers (US Patent 5,733,682).

Yoshida and Koga are relied upon as discussed above, specifically in the rejection of claim 8, but do not disclose that the powder used be an alloy having at least 20 wt% of chromium (Cr) component (claim 13), or that the alloy contain Cr, iron (Fe) and one or more metallic or ceramic alloy of at most 40 wt%.

Quadakkers discloses a bipolar plate (i.e., interconnector or separator) for a fuel cell and a composition of the same. One composition specifically disclosed by Quadakkers include (all percentages given are based on weight) 20% Cr, 5% aluminum (Al), 0.5% Yttrium Oxide (Y_2O_3), balance (74,5%) Fe, this composition is said to have superior corrosion resistance (Col 2 lines 1-3, 13-14, see also claim 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to use the composition taught by Quadakkers and discussed above in the process of Yoshinda and Koga since Quadakkers discloses that such a composition is effective as a fuel cell separator and creates a separator with increased corrosion resistance.

Referring to claim 15, Yoshida, Koga and Quadakkers are relied upon as discussed above, further they all discuss where the molding produced is an interconnector or separator for a fuel cell.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell J. Kemmerle whose telephone number is 571-272-6509. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RJK


STEVEN P. GRIFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700